

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/638,848	08/11/2003	Ellen Myra Dobrusin	5716-D1	4448
28880	7590 02/22/2006		EXAMINER	
WARNER-LAMBERT COMPANY 2800 PLYMOUTH RD			TRUONG, TAMTHOM NGO	
	MI 48105		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1624	

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summers	10/638,848	DOBRUSIN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tamthom N. Truong	1624					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Oc</u>	ctoher 2005						
·	, 						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

Art Unit: 1624

NON-FINAL ACTION

Applicant's amendment of 10-05-05 is acknowledged.

Based on the "Decision on Rehearing" of the Interference No. 104,798 (paper #121), and the "Judgment—Rule 640" (paper #117), the previous rejection of 102(e) based on Harris et. al. (US'373) and Dunn et. al. (US'241) is withdrawn since applicants were deemed to be entitled to benefit of their PCT filing date.

Claims 1-6 are still pending.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-6 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 09/623,737.

Art Unit: 1624

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter of the instant claims 1-6 reads substantially (if not identically) on claims of 09/623,737 as the instant case is a refiled case of 09/623,737.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The parent application (09/623,737) has been involved in Interference No. 104,798. In PALM, the last entry is "Interference Decision on Priority – Adverse" to application 09/623,737. Subsequent papers (provided by applicants) have not been entered in PALM. It is recognized that amended claims 56, 59 and 60 of 09/623,737 were awarded to applicants as set forth in "Judgment – Rule 640" (pager #117) filed 10-05-05. However, it is not evident if the instant claims (1-6) correspond to the awarded claims as the Examiner has been unable to obtain the parent file.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamthom N. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-0676. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

. Tamthom N. Truong

Examiner Art Unit 1624

2-16-06

PRIMARY STATISTICS OF THE PRIMARY STATISTICS OF THE PRIMARY STATISTICS OF THE PRIMARDT PRIMARD PRI

F Bankeudl

Page 4